Attorney Docket No.: Q76059

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

Application No.: 10/647,300

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-14 and 16-22 are pending in the application and stand rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8-16 and 18-22 stand rejected as being anticipated by Myers et al. (2001).

In the Amendment filed September 16, 2008, Applicants submitted that Myers fails to disclose:

a control signal input unit that receives at least one control signal transmitted from an input device to control operations of the media file management system;

an interface unit that accesses media files stored in another information appliance by the control signal, and receives the media files.

Specifically, it was submitted that Myers merely discloses that Silver is to "support different kinds of productions" such as "original compositions." It was also noted that one example of such an original composition disclosed in Myers is video shot with a camcorder. (p. 108, col. 2). However, Myers is silent with regard to how this video file is received by Silver. Consequently, Myers fails to disclose that this file could be accessed by Silver while being stored in the camcorder. To the extent that Myers discloses that it would support video productions recorded by a camcorder, it does not disclose an interface unit which accesses the files stored in another information appliance.

In the Response to Arguments section of this Office Action, the Examiner contends:

First, people might just shoot some video with a camcorder, and then later want to edit into a production. The camcorder has been interpreted as the claimed "another information appliance..." (Page 108, column 2, Types of Productions section). Further,

Attorney Docket No.: Q76059

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

Application No.: 10/647,300

Myers describes such feature is well known in the art. For example, Myers describes the Hitchcock system automatically determines the suitability of the different segments in raw video based on camera motion which reasonably represents the argued limitation of 'an interface unit that accesses media files stored in another information appliance by the control signal, and receives the media file." Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make and use the system of Myers with another information appliance such as a camcorder.

(Office Action, p. 2)

In response, it is submitted that Myers' Silver application is expressly limited to video data processed by Informedia. In this regard, Myers expressly discloses that the source video and metadata is obtained from CMU's Informedia Digital Library. (p. 108, col. 1). It is Informedia's unique processing which creates textual transcripts using speech recognition, thumbnail extracts, image analysis and metadata, which permit Myer's Silver to support original compositions. (p. 108, col. 1 through col. 2). As such, Silver cannot merely access a camcorder as alleged by the Examiner. Rather, Silver must import the video data and metadata after processing using Informedia, a wholly independent application.

In this regard, Myers provides:

In these two cases where new material is shot, we anticipate that the material will be *processed by Informedia* to supply the metadata that Silver needs.

(Myers, page 108, section 5 (emphasis added).

Therefore, Applicants submit that Myers fails to disclose a file could be accessed by Silver while being stored in the camcorder. Rather, Myers teaches away from taking video directly from a camcorder device. As expressly disclosed therein, Silver needs metadata to function properly. Accordingly, Myers fails to disclose "an interface unit that

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 Attorney Docket No.: Q76059

Application No.: 10/647,300

accesses media files stored in another information appliance by the control signal, and receives the media files," as recited in claim 1.

Thus, Applicants submit claim 1 is allowable for at least this reason. Additionally, because claims 12 and 20 recite a similar feature, Applicants submit these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above. Finally, Applicants submit claims 2, 5-6, 8-11, 13-16, 18-19 and 21-22 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 4 stands rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Myers as applied to claims 1, 2, 5-6, 8-16 and 18-22 above, and in further view of Chernock et al. (US 6,229,524).

Applicants submit that because Chernock, either taken alone or in combination with Myers, fails to compensate for the above noted deficiencies of Myers as applied to claim 1, claim 4 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7 and 17 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Myers as applied to claims 1, 2, 5-6, 8-16 and 18-22.

In particular, the Examiner concedes Myers fails to disclose displaying paths of the media files in the edit or search windows. However, the Examiner alleges that Myers suggests a plan to add support for any other views that might be useful. Thus, the Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to add www links (paths).

However, Applicants submit that because the Examiner alleged modification, either taken alone or in combination with Myers, fails to compensate for the above noted deficiencies of Myers as applied to claim 1, claims 7 and 17 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 Attorney Docket No.: Q76059

Application No.: 10/647,300

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/David P. Emery/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060 Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 25, 2009

David P. Emery

Registration No. 55,154